

Claim 25, which depends on claim 24, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, presumably for the same reason that claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As described above, claim 24 has been rewritten to overcome that rejection; hence, dependent claim 25 should also be deemed to have overcome that rejection. The Examiner further indicated that claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten, not only to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, but also "to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim." Applicants submit that such inclusion in claim 25 is not required because claim 25 depends from amended claim 24, which as presently rewritten, is now allowable, and the language in claim 25 itself has never been objected to. Applicants believe that dependent claim 25 is also in condition for allowance.

Applicants believe that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, have been overcome that Applicants have complied with any objections and/or requirements as to form, and thus respectfully request that claims 1, 3-11, 14-19, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 37 and 38 be allowed to issue. If there are any remaining issues, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David P. Ruschke  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 40,151  
Medtronic, Inc.  
710 Medtronic Parkway NE  
Minneapolis, MN 55432  
Phone: 763-505-2913  
Fax: 763-505-2530